

To:
DEAN A. ERSFELD
OFFICE OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY COUNSEL
POST OFFICE BOX 33427
SAINT PAUL, MN 55133-3427

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

Date of mailing
(day/month/year) **29 MAR 2006**

Applicant's or agent's file reference

58885WO006

FOR FURTHER ACTION

See paragraph 2 below

International application No.

PCT/US04/39512

International filing date (day/month/year)

24 November 2004 (24.11.2004)

Priority date (day/month/year)

25 November 2003 (25.11.2003)

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC

IPC(8): C07D 471/04 and US Cl.: 546/118

Applicant

3M INNOVATIVE PROPERTIES COMPANY

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- ☒ Box No. I Basis of the opinion
- ☐ Box No. II Priority
- ☒ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- ☒ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
- ☒ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- ☐ Box No. VI Certain documents cited
- ☐ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
- ☐ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

2. FURTHER ACTION

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA/ US

Mail Stop PCT, Attn: ISA/US
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

Facsimile No. (571) 273-3201

Authorized officer

Celia Chang

Telephone No. 571-272-1600

J. Roberts for

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/USD4/39512

Box No. I Basis of this opinion

1. With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.

☐ This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language _____, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).

2. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:

a. type of material

☐ a sequence listing

☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing

b. format of material

☐ in written format

☐ in computer readable form

c. time of filing/furnishing

☐ contained in international application as filed.

☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.

☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.

3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.

4. Additional comments:

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/US04/39512

Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability

I. The questions whether the claimed invention appears to be novel, to involve an inventive step (to be non-obvious), or to be industrially applicable have not been examined in respect of:

☐ the entire international application

☒ claims Nos. 12-32

because:

☐ the said international application, or the said claim Nos. _____ relate to the following subject matter which does not require an international preliminary examination (*specify*):

☒ the description, claims or drawings (*indicate particular elements below*) or said claims Nos. 12-32 are so unclear that no meaningful opinion could be formed (*specify*):

☐ the claims, or said claims Nos. _____ are so inadequately supported by the description that no meaningful opinion could be formed.

☒ no international search report has been established for said claims Nos. 12-32

☐ the nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence listing does not comply with the standard provided for in Annex C of the Administrative Instructions in that:

the written form

☐

has not been furnished

☐

does not comply with the standard

the computer readable form

☐

has not been furnished

☐

does not comply with the standard

☐ the tables related to the nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence listing, if in computer readable form only, do not comply with the technical requirements provided for in Annex C-*bis* of the Administrative Instructions.

☐ See Supplemental Box for further details.

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/US04/39512

Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention

1. ☒ In response to the invitation (Form PCT/ISA/206) to pay additional fees the applicant has:
- ☒ paid additional fees
 - ☐ paid additional fees under protest
 - ☐ not paid additional fees
2. ☐ This Authority found that the requirement of unity of invention is not complied with and chose not to invite the applicant to pay additional fees.
3. This Authority considers that the requirement of unity of invention in accordance with Rule 13.1, 13.2 and 13.3 is
- ☐ complied with
 - ☒ not complied with for the following reasons:

See the lack of unity section of the International Search Report (Form PCT/ISA/210)

4. Consequently, this opinion has been established in respect of the following parts of the international application:

- ☐ all parts.
- ☒ the parts relating to claims Nos. 1 (in part) 2-11

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.
PCT/US04/39512

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43 bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Claims <u>3-5 and 7-11</u>	YES
	Claims <u>1 (in part), 2 and 6</u>	NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims <u>3, 4, 9 and 10</u>	YES
	Claims <u>1 (in part), 2, 5-8 and 11</u>	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims <u>1 (in part) and 2-11</u>	YES
	Claims <u>NONE</u>	NO

2. Citations and explanations:

Claims 1 (in part), 2 and 6 lack novelty under PCT Article 33(2) as being anticipated by US 5,756,747, see col. 17, line 36.

Claims 3-5, 7-11 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(2), because the prior art does not anticipate the claims 4-amino-1H-imidazol[4,5-c]pyridine compounds or the particular R_A - R_B forms saturated ring.

Claims 1, 2, 5-8, 11 lack an inventive step under PCT Article 33(3) as being obvious over US 5,756,747. The species wherein Z is CO was anticipated by '747 example 26. The broader scope of the other claims are obvious variation of protecting groups as disclosed by the references see col. 5-8, reaction scheme and description.

Claims 3, 4, 9, 10 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(2)-(3) because the prior art does not teach or fairly suggest the claimed compounds.

Claims 1 (in part), 2-11 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(4), and thus have industrial applicability because the subject matter claimed can be made or used in industry.